

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLOTTE A. HAMANN,

No. C-03-0437 EMC

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF OAKLAND, *et al.*,

Defendants.

**ORDER SETTING BRIEFING
SCHEDULE AND HEARING DATE FOR
KAISER AND CITY DEFENDANTS'
MOTIONS FOR REVIEW OF
TAXATION OF COSTS**

The Court has received Ms. Hamann's letter, dated January 15, 2008, and filed on January 16, 2008, in which she asks that the hearing on the Kaiser and City Defendants' motions for review of taxation of costs be rescheduled. The Court hereby **GRANTS** the request.

The hearing on the two motions shall be rescheduled for **February 27, 2008, at 10:30 a.m.** Although Ms. Hamann asks for a hearing in early April, she does not explain why the hearing should be delayed for more than two months. Moreover, the Court does not see any reason to delay the hearing for more than two months given that the motions present simple issues (*e.g.*, did Defendants provide the verification required by 28 U.S.C. § 1924).

The Court further orders that Ms. Hamann file oppositions to the two motions by **February 6, 2008**, and that Defendants file their respective replies by **February 13, 2008**.

///

///


///

///

1 Finally, the Court attaches to this order copies of the Clerk's letters to Defendants regarding
2 taxation of costs.

3
4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5
6 Dated: January 17, 2008

7
8 
9 EDWARD M. CHEN
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28